

REMARKS

This current Reply is responsive to a current and Non-final Office Action dated (mailed) 06/07/2006. This current Office Action examined claims 1-26.

Generally, the current Office Action rejected claims 1-26.

Specifically, the rejection was as follows (from pages 2 and 3):

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess. (US 6,192,512).

As per claims 1-26, Chess teaches a system for processing command line input, the system comprising: a command line interface comprising a set of executable commands; and a command line processor for, at least: parsing the command line input; identifying one or more macros within the input, expanding the one or more macros into at least one executable command of the command line interface, and executing the commands independent of compilation.

(Abstract, cols.2-8)

Chess teaches the use of interpreters that are often embedded inside application program subsystems for a specific language in which the word processor macros are written. Chess teaches a macro with an application program subsystem, having a macro interpreter, so as to detect a presence of potential viral activity. The method includes the steps of: (a) making an API call with a program, the API call identifying the macro and specifying an initial virtual environment within which the macro is to be interpreted; (b) interpreting in turn individual instructions of the macro; (c) altering the virtual environment in response to interpreted instructions; and (d) notifying the program upon the occurrence of an alteration to the virtual environment that triggers a predetermined notification criterion. The step of notifying the program can also take place upon the occurrence of the interpretation of the macro triggering a predetermined termination criterion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that Chess teaches the use of interpreters that expand the macro - line by line - before complication into an executable file.

1
2 No claims are canceled or added by this Reply. Hence, claims 1-26 are
3 presented for examination. Of claims 1-26, claims 1, 9, and 15 are independent.
4
5

6 It is believed that the claims were allowable in their previous forms.
7 However, to facilitate prosecution and expedite the ultimate allowance of the
8 Instant Patent Application, certain claims have been amended as indicated above.

9 These amendments more clearly evidence the differences between the
10 applied art (e.g., Chess) and the claimed invention. The independent claims now
11 read as follows.

12 Claim 1 reads, in pertinent part, **expanding the macro by replacing the**
13 **macro with an executable command of the command line interface, the**
14 **executable command comprising a string.**

15 Claim 9 reads, in pertinent part, **expanding the macro by replacing the**
16 **macro with an executable command of a command line interface, the**
17 **executable command comprising a string.**

18 Claim 15 reads, in pertinent part, **expanding the one or more macros by**
19 **replacing the one or more macros with at least one executable command of**
20 **the command line interface, the at least one executable command comprising**
21 **at least one string.**

1 Chess (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,512) does not render the pending claims
2 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103.

3
4
5 A. The "macro" of Chess does not correspond to the **macro** of the
6 pending claims.

7
8 1. The "macro" of Chess corresponds to an executable program.

9 This is evidenced, for example, by the following portions of Chess:

10 A computer application program subsystem (100) includes a program
11 interpreter (120) and an application program interface (API 110) through which
12 an external program requests an *execution of a program of interest, such as a*
13 *macro*, in a specified simulated environment.

14 *(italicized emphasis added; Chess; Abstract, First Five Lines)*

15 A method is disclosed for exercising a macro with an application
16 program subsystem, having a macro interpreter, so as to detect a presence of
17 potential viral activity. The method includes the steps of: (a) making an API call
18 with a program, the API call identifying the macro and specifying an initial
19 virtual environment within which the macro is to be interpreted; (b) *interpreting*
20 *in turn individual instructions of the macro;* (c) altering the virtual environment
21 in response to interpreted instructions; and (d) notifying the program upon the
22 occurrence of an alteration to the virtual environment that triggers a
23 predetermined notification criterion.

24 *(italicized emphasis added; Chess; Column 2, Lines 42-52)*

25 A *program of interest, such as a macro* written in a language that the
26 interpreter is capable of interpreting, is passed through the virtual API 110 from
27 an external program (i.e., a program that exists outside of the application
28 program subsystem 100.)

29 *(italicized emphasis added; Chess; Column 5, Lines 17-21)*

1
2. In contrast, each **macro** of the pending claims is an **input line**,
3 or portion thereof, for a command line interface. Consequently, the
4 “macro” of Chess can not be used to anticipate or render obvious the **macro**
5 of the pending claims.

6
7
B. The “macro” of Chess is not replaced; consequently, it can not be
8 replaced by a **string**, as in the pending claims.

9
10 1. The “macro” of Chess does not appear to be replaced.
11 A review of Chess indicates that its “macros” are executed or interpreted.
12 They are not replaced.

13
14 2. In contrast, each **macro** of the pending claims is replaced by
15 an **executable command**, which comprises a **string**, during the expansion
16 of the **macro**. Because, Chess does not describe or suggest replacing a
17 **macro** with a **string**, it can not be used to anticipate or render obvious the
18 **pending claims.**

C. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the pending claims 1-26 are patentable over Chess.

It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims 1-26 are patentable over Chess because (A) the “macro” of Chess does not correspond to the **macro** of the pending claims and (B) the “macro” of Chess is not replaced by a **string**.

Dependent Claims

Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 9, and 15 have been provided above. Claims 2-8/22-26, 10-14, and 16-21 depend directly or indirectly from these independent claims 1, 9, and 15, respectively. Although each also includes additional element(s) militating toward allowability, these dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons given above in connection with their respective independent claims.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of claims 1-26 are allowable. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to pass the instant Patent Application to issue.

However, if the Examiner determines that there are any remaining issues that preclude the issuance of a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to schedule an Interview prior to issuing another Office Action, in accordance with the accompanying PTOL-413A: Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 1/7/2006

By: Keith W. Saunders
Keith W. Saunders
Reg. No. 41,462
(509) 324-9256 x238